

PASAA

Volume 58

July - December 2019

Training Students in Peer Interaction and Peer Feedback to Develop Competence in L2 forms

Hatice OKYAR*

School of Foreign Languages, Necmettin Erbakan University,
42060 Konya, Turkey

Email: okyarhatice@gmail.com

Gonca EKŞİ

English Language Teaching Department, Gazi University,
06500 Ankara, Turkey

Abstract

This study investigates the role of peer interaction (PI) and peer corrective feedback (PCF) in developing EFL learners' grammatical competence regarding simple past tense. It is based on training university-level English preparatory class students in Turkey to interact with their peers and give oral corrective feedback to each other's target grammar errors during communicative tasks. Three classes (n=85) were randomly assigned to the peer interaction (PI) group, the peer interaction and recast (PI+Recast) group or the peer interaction and metalinguistic feedback (PI+MF) group. The PI group was only trained to do communicative tasks in pairs and did not receive any feedback training; however, the PI+Recast group and the PI+MF group were trained to give recasts and MF, respectively. Pairs of learners were audio-recorded while they were trying to complete communicative activities that required the use of the simple past tense. 21 hours of audio-recorded data obtained from the learners' dialogues were examined for instances of PCF. Furthermore, receptive

and productive measures were used to identify the effects of the intervention. The findings show that the PI+Recast and PI+MF groups performed better than the PI only group in terms of receptive knowledge and accurate use of the simple past tense.

Keywords: Peer interaction, corrective feedback, oral peer corrective feedback

Introduction

Corrective feedback (CF), in its most general sense, is a way of informing learners about their erroneous second language (L2) production (Ellis, Loewen, & Erlam, 2006; Lightbown & Spada, 2006). The beneficial role of CF in L2 learning has been highlighted by many researchers so far (e.g. Ellis, 2006; Gass & Mackey, 2007; Lyster & Ranta; 1997; Lyster, Lightbown, & Spada, 1999; Panova & Lyster, 2002) and the growing body of evidence continues to point to the effectiveness of providing L2 learners with CF (Lyster et al., 1999). For instance, some meta-analyses (e.g. Lyster & Saito, 2010; Russell & Spada, 2006) provide valuable information related to the positive effects of CF on L2 development like improvement of L2 grammar knowledge and so on. In relation to the effectiveness of CF, there are numerous studies with a specific focus on issues such as which CF type to use (implicit or explicit; output prompting or input providing) and which errors to correct (grammar, vocabulary etc.). For instance, some studies have focused on the effects of different CF types on various language components such as phonology, noun-adjective agreement, nouns, lexis, grammar structures, questions, vocabulary and so on (see Algarawi, 2010; Ammar & Spada, 2006; Carroll & Swain, 1993; Dilans, 2010; Ellis, 2007; Ellis et al., 2006; Erlam & Loewen, 2010; Loewen & Nabei, 2007; Sheen, 2010; Yang & Lyster, 2010). It is important to emphasize here that while most prior studies are based on oral teacher CF and its' impacts on L2 development (e.g. Ammar & Spada, 2006; Carroll & Swain, 1993; Dilans, 2010; Ellis, 2007; Ellis et al., 2006; Loewen & Philp, 2006;

Lyster, 2004; Mackey, 2006; Yang & Lyster, 2010), only a few studies have focused on the effects of peer oral CF on L2 learning (e.g. Adams, 2007; Chu 2013; Sato & Lyster, 2012; Sippel & Jackson, 2015).

The abundance of studies on teacher CF may be the result of the fact that during teacher-learner meaning-focused interactions, teachers can specifically direct learners' attention to L2 forms and can effectively give CF on learners' inaccurate uses (Sippel, 2017). Contrary to this, during peer interactive tasks, L2 learners do not generally pay attention to the grammatical forms and do not typically provide their peers with CF for their non-grammatical uses if they are not explicitly trained to do so (Sato & Lyster, 2012). The current study addresses the problem that Turkish EFL learners, despite receiving extensive grammar instruction, generally have difficulty producing grammatically accurate utterances, and therefore, as a remedy, training the learners as CF providers to each other during interactive tasks may help them overcome this problem (see Adams, Nuevo, & Egi, 2011). Bearing this in mind, this study investigates the effects of oral PCF in learner-learner interactive contexts by training learners to provide CF to each other's errors related to the target linguistic structure. To this end, two CF types, namely recast and MF, are the focus of the study, which considers their input-providing and output-prompting nature, respectively. Thus, the study aims to gain insights into the effects of these two CF types within the framework of PCF integrated into the PI process.

Theoretical Framework on the Effectiveness of CF

The effectiveness of CF on L2 development during interaction has been explained from various viewpoints. For instance, some researchers explain positive effects of CF through the lens of the interaction approach (e.g. Gass, 1997; Gass, Behney, & Plonsky, 2013; Gass & Mackey, 2007; Long, 1996, 2007). According to this framework, interaction is comprised of three main components: modified input, feedback, modified output (Gass & Mackey, 2007). The emergence of CF during

interaction can contribute to the language learning process, as CF can lead learners to revise their incorrect production of the target forms and reproduce, in other words, modify them (Gass, 2003; Gass & Mackey, 2007; Long, 1996). This attention-drawing function of CF can also be explained under the umbrella of Schmidt's Noticing Hypothesis (1990, 2012), which emphasizes that learning can take place through learners' attention and noticing of the L2 input. The important point here is that awareness of the target L2 structures can be facilitated by the help of CF as some studies show (e.g. Mackey, 2006; Miller, 2003). During interaction, CF can help learners to identify the gap, meaning the difference between their own production and the target-like forms of the L2 (Gass & Mackey, 2007; Long, 1996; Reinders, 2010; Sato & Ballinger, 2016). There are also researchers who address interaction and CF within the framework of skill acquisition theories (e.g. Anderson, 2005; DeKeyser, 2007; Leeman, 2007, Lyster & Sato, 2013; Ranta & Lyster, 2007). For example, Anderson's Adaptive Control of Thought model (see Anderson, 1983, 1993) highlights the significant role of practice and feedback in learning (Anderson, 2005; Leeman, 2007, Ranta & Lyster, 2007). The two types of knowledge in this model, namely declarative and procedural knowledge, refer to "knowledge about language" and "knowledge of how to use language" (Nassaji, 2015, p. 67), respectively. Practice (e.g. using language extensively during interactive tasks) and feedback can help learners' declarative knowledge turn into procedural knowledge (McLaughlin & Heredia, 1996). Based on all these viewpoints, *interaction* and its major components *input, feedback and output* (see Gass et al., 2013; Gass & Mackey, 2007) seem to play a crucial role in L2 development.

Peer Interaction and Peer Corrective Feedback

Interaction in the context of language learning is simply defined as "the conversations that learners participate in" (Gass & Mackey, 2007, p. 178). With regard to this, PI refers to "any communicative activity carried out between learners, where there

is minimal or no participation from the teacher” (Philp, Adams, & Iwashita, 2014, p. 3). During PI activities, learners come together and contribute to each other’s learning (Philp et al., 2014); this process is usually accompanied by a supportive attitude of learners to their peers (Foster & Ohta, 2005). Another important feature of PI is that each student has a chance to express himself or herself through the target language, and can practice what they learn many times (Harmer, 2007; Philp, Walter, & Basturkmen, 2010). This opportunity to practice, in relation to the skill acquisition theories, may be helpful in turning declarative knowledge into procedural knowledge (Devos, 2016; McLaughlin & Heredia, 1996). Learners, as stated by Morris (2002, p. 395), can have the chance to “modify their output, focus on their interlanguage grammar, notice the gaps in their language system, and create more complex target-like forms” in the course of interaction.

It is also important to note that learners can be more autonomous during PI, as the teacher’s intervention is decreased during learner-learner interaction activities (Harmer, 2007). As students work collaboratively during pair work, they can get help from each other when they have any difficulties (Philp et al., 2014). Therefore, the role of *peer feedback* during PI is important to highlight. Learners want to receive feedback to their errors (Brown, 2007); in this regard, peer feedback can be helpful for informing learners about their accurate and inaccurate productions (Gass & Mackey, 2007). During interactive activities with their peers, learners, by being both feedback providers and receivers, can get more information about their inaccurate productions (Adams et al., 2011; Sato & Lyster, 2012; Sippel & Jackson, 2015). However, as highlighted before, while teacher CF has been examined thoroughly through both experimental and non-experimental methods, PCF studies have generally been confined to descriptive designs (e.g. whether learners can provide CF to their peers during PI activities) (Lyster, Saito, & Sato, 2013). Furthermore, the abundance of research on teacher CF creates the perception that the responsibility of correcting errors only

belongs to L2 teachers (Ohta, 2000). The fact that L2 learners lack experience correcting each other's grammatical errors during interactive tasks and the scarcity of studies related to training learners as CF providers to each other point to the need for more detailed research studies. Based on these gaps, this study addresses the following research questions (RQs):

1. Is the type and rate of CF provided by students influenced by the explicit training they receive?
2. What are the effects of the PI, the PI+Recast and the PI+MF on receptive and productive knowledge of the target grammar structure?

Methodology

Context and participants

This study was carried out at a state university in Turkey. There were a total of 85 participants (55 male and 30 female), with a mean age of 18.6. The participants were first-year EFL learners in the English preparatory program at the school of foreign languages. Before taking classes in their departments (e.g. aircraft engineering), participants had to take a one-year compulsory English class, with an instruction time of 25 hours per week. Three classes were arbitrarily assigned to 1) PI group (n=28), 2) PI+Recast group (n=29), 3) PI+MF group (n=28). None of the students in the groups had experience living in an English-speaking country or studying English abroad.

Data collection procedure

Target linguistic structure

The simple past tense is the focus of this research study, for a variety of reasons. Firstly, it is one of the most difficult grammatical forms to master for EFL learners (Kartchava & Ammar, 2014), and learners have difficulty in gaining complete control over the use of it even at high proficiency levels (see Adams et al., 2011; Ellis et al. 2006; Yang & Lyster, 2010). The most common problems in relation to the use of the simple past tense are: a) Replacement of the simple past tense forms with the simple

present (Coelho, 2004; Collins, 2009; Ellis et al., 2006); b) inaccuracy in the use of *was*, *were* (Collins, 2009); c) Overgeneralization of past marking (-ed) to irregular verb inflections (Coelho, 2004; Collins, 2009); d) Using the simple past form of the main verb in interrogative and negative past sentences (Collins, 2009). This current study, considering the aforementioned factors, focuses on receptive and productive knowledge of the simple past tense including both regular and irregular forms. The participants in the present study were already familiar with the target grammatical structure. Therefore, instead of researching the effects of the intervention on a totally new grammatical structure, this study investigates whether the students can gain greater control over the target structure.

Target CF types

This study focuses on two CF types, namely recasts and MF. While recasts refer to the “reformulation of all or part of a student’s utterance, minus the error,” MF refers to “comments, information, or questions related to the well-formedness of the student’s utterance, without explicitly providing the correct form” (Lyster & Ranta, 1997, pp. 46-47). These feedback types are generally distinguished from each other according to their implicit and explicit nature (Ellis, 2015; Lyster et al., 2013). Despite the general consensus that recasts are an implicit CF type, some factors (e.g. length of recasts) can cause them to sound more explicit (see Ellis & Sheen, 2006; Loewen & Philp, 2006; Nassaji, 2015). Moreover, DeKeyser (2017) underlines that recasts emerge as an explicit CF type when learners identify them as CF. As for MF, this practice directly stresses the existence of errors and lead learners to self-repair them (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Nassaji, 2015), and therefore, some researchers argue that MF seems more effective than recasts, as it enables learners to see the difference between their errors and target-like forms (e.g. Ellis et al., 2006). In addition to their degree of implicitness or explicitness, recasts and MF have also been considered with regard to their input-providing and output-prompting nature, respectively (see Adams

et al., 2011; Ellis, 2008; Ellis, 2015; Long, 2007). Recasts as an input-providing CF type directly provide learners with the correct form; however, MF as an output-prompting CF type triggers learners to produce the correct form themselves—in other words, to self-correct their own errors (see Pawlak, 2014). As this study involves training learners as CF providers and so makes both recasts and MF explicit to them, recasts and MF were compared according to their input-providing and output-prompting features rather than their implicitness or explicitness.

Training procedure

The phases of the training in this study were determined by considering Sato's (2011) implementation steps, which are based on the Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach, offered by Chamot, Barnhardt, El-Dinary, and Robins (1999). In the light of this framework, Sato (2011) adopted Modeling, Practice and Use-in-Context phases in his study. This current research was designed following these phases with minor differences. The following figure presents the training procedure and intervention process for the simple past tense:

PI Group	PI+Recast Group	PI+MF Group
↓	↓	↓
Training period (3 weeks)		
1. Modeling PI	1. Modeling PI+Recast	1. Modeling PI+MF
2. Use-in-context	2. Practice giving recast	2. Practice giving MF
	3. Use-in-context	3. Use-in-context
Start of the intervention process for the "Simple Past tense"		
↓	↓	↓
Pre-tests (GJT and writing task)		
1. Modeling PI	1. Modeling PI+Recast	1. Modeling PI+MF
2. Use-in-context (audio-recording)	2. Use-in-context (audio-recording)	2. Use-in-context (audio-recording)
Post-tests (GJT and writing task)		
Delayed post-test (GJT and writing task)		

Figure 1. Implementation process of the study

The first three weeks of the study were devoted to the training period, so that the students could get used to doing interactive activities and providing CF. With this aim, three grammatical structures (i.e. *simple present tense, have got/has got, there is/there are*) were targeted. Each week, the students had the opportunity to practice the previously taught grammar topic through interactive tasks. While modeling, practice and use-in-context phases were implemented in the PI+Recast and PI+MF groups, only modeling and use-in-context steps were followed in the PI group as this group did not need to practice giving feedback.

In the modeling phase, mini role-play activities, which were composed of short dialogues, were performed in front of the class by the instructor and a volunteer student from each group. These dialogues covered the grammatical structure of the week. For instance, for the grammatical structure *there is /there are*, the dialogue involved the description of a room through use of these structures. In the PI group, the dialogues did not contain any examples of errors or CF. The basic aim was to show learners how to use the target structure in interactive tasks and work with their peers. As for the PI+Recast and PI+MF groups, the dialogues included examples of target grammar errors and target CF types. For example, in the PI+Recast group, the volunteer student committed errors during the dialogue, and the instructor provided recasts to the target grammatical errors. For the PI+MF groups, the instructor provided MF. The purpose of the modeling part of the class was to explain the nature of the target feedback types to the students. Therefore, the PI+MF group was informed that MF points to the existence of an error by withholding the correct form and so encourages self-correction, and the PI+Recast group was informed that recasts refer to giving the correct form without any explicit or direct explanation about the errors (see Lyster & Ranta, 1997). Additionally, each dialogue was presented through PowerPoint presentation to show the learners the examples of target CF types one more time (see Sippel, 2017). It took approximately 10 to 15 minutes to complete the modeling phase.

In the practice phase, only the PI+Recast and PI+MF groups practiced giving target CF types to the target grammar errors. 10 or 15 minutes was allocated for this phase for three weeks. The instructor presented mini talks to the whole class that were composed of both accurate and inaccurate uses of the target grammar structure of each week. For instance, for the simple present tense, the instructor described different people; and in this mini talk, some errors related to the use of simple present tense were inserted. The students in PI+Recast group were asked to provide recasts to the target grammar errors, while the students in the PI+MF group were requested to give MF to the errors they noticed. The main purpose of this phase was to give the students opportunities to practice giving the target CF types.

As for the use-in-context phase, more authentic communicative tasks were designed to lead learners to use the target grammar structures in more meaningful contexts. The students in the PI group were asked to do the activities with their peers by using the target grammar structure. On the other hand, the students in the feedback groups were asked to give the target CF type (recasts in the PI+Recast group and MF in the PI+MF group) to each other's target grammar errors. At least two communicative activities were designed for each grammar structure to help learners become familiar with the PI and PCF. This phase took 35 or 45 minutes each week.

Intervention process for the simple past tense

When the aforementioned phases during the training period were completed, the intervention process carried on with the target grammar structure, namely the simple past tense. After ensuring that the simple past tense had been taught to all the groups, pre-tests (grammaticality judgment test and writing task) were administered to each of them. One day after the administration of the pre-tests, each group was first presented with the modeling part, which consisted of a mini dialogue containing simple past tense sentences. This dialogue was free of errors and CF in the PI group. For the feedback groups, this

dialogue consisted of simple past tense errors and examples of recasts, for the PI+Recast group, and MF, for the PI+MF group (see Appendix 1). When the modeling phase ended, the students in the groups were randomly matched in pairs for the use-in-context section. As the students were accustomed to providing CF to each other during the three-week training period, the modeling phase was immediately followed by the use-in-context part that included four communicative activities. These activities were 1) question-answer activities, 2) picture-cued narrative activities, 3) storytelling activities, 4) telling stories about memory activities (see Appendix 2). Each of the first three activities had two versions for each student in pairs and all of the four activities required the use of the simple past tense. The question and answer activities were composed of 16 questions about the last holiday and 18 questions about the last birthday party the students had. Picture cued narrative activities were composed of picture sets (22 and 23 pictures for the first and second one, respectively) and verbs to compose a story in simple past tense. As for the storytelling activities, students were asked to make up a story with the given verbs (12 verbs for each story) considering the introductory sentences of the stories. Finally, the telling stories about memory activity asked learners to talk about one of their memories. The students in the PI group were only asked to complete the activities by using the simple past tense. The students in the PI+Recast group were reminded to give recasts, and the students in the PI+MF were asked provide MF to their peers' simple past tense errors during the communicative tasks. The first two activities (i.e. question-answer and picture-cued narrative activities) were assigned for the first week, and the other two (i.e. storytelling and telling stories about memory) were given to the groups one week later. Students' conversations in pairs while performing each communicative activity were audio-recorded. Immediate posttests were given after the communicative activities were completed; delayed posttests were administered 12 days later.

Testing instruments and scoring

Grammaticality judgment tests (GJTs)

GJTs were used with the aim of measuring learners' receptive knowledge regarding the simple past tense. GJTs provide a way to gauge whether learners can identify grammatical and ungrammatical structures (Gass, 1994). In this study, GJTs were conducted to see whether the participants could differentiate between correct and incorrect simple past tense forms, including in affirmative, negative and interrogative structures. Two versions of the GJT, each consisting of 28 items, were prepared by the researchers. Out of 28 items, 21 included correct and incorrect use of the simple past tense, and the other 7 items were composed of distractors. The content of the pre- and post-GJTs was the same; however, the delayed GJT included novel items that did not appear in the pre- and post-test. After the GJTs were checked by four native speakers, they were piloted on students with backgrounds similar to that of the study participants. The KR-20 reliability coefficient was found to be .835 and .816 for pre- and delayed post-test, respectively. After ensuring that the GJTs were highly reliable, they were administered to the target groups as pre-, post-, and delayed post-test. The participants were asked to judge the items in terms of grammaticality without any time limit. Each correct and incorrect answer of a student was awarded 1 point and 0 points, respectively; however, the students were only given 1 point on condition that they wrote the correct form of the item that they judged as ungrammatical.

Written production task

Writing tasks were used to find out whether PI and PCF facilitated the accurate use of the simple past tense. Therefore, accuracy in production of the simple past tense, rather than fluency, was the main focus of the study. Two narrative writing tasks were developed, one for the pre- and post-test, and one for the delayed post-test. Each of the tasks provided 18 verbs and the students were asked to use all of them. Each story consisted of a few sentences given as an introduction; students were prompted

to complete the stories. 45 minutes was allocated for each writing task, based on feedback from the pilot studies. A scoring rubric was developed considering some resources (e.g. Coelho, 2004; Collins, 2009), earlier studies (e.g. Yang, 2008), and learners' common problems related to the use of the simple past tense. Scoring of the papers was not solely based on the use of the given verbs as they were only provided to encourage the students to write more sentences. Students were scored based on the proportion of correct forms out of all simple past tense forms produced in each paper; correct verb forms were scored equally, regardless of the regularity of the verb or the syntactic construction involved.

Data analysis procedure

Analysis of the interactional data

The interactional data were analyzed to find out whether feedback groups, i.e., PI+Recast and PI+MF would provide the target CF types to each other's simple past tense errors. Also, the students' dialogues in PI group were also examined to see whether they could provide feedback to each other without getting any CF training. 21 hours of audio-recorded data were transcribed, and occurrences of simple past tense errors, recasts, MF and other CF types were identified and tallied. Other types of errors (e.g. article errors, lexical errors) were not included in the analysis. The following CF types were determined in learner-learner interactions: MF, MF combined with direct correction, recast, explicit feedback, repetition, direct question and clarification request. After the identification of the errors and the CF types, each individual student's data was written in a coding scheme to get numerical findings through quantification. The excerpts from the students' dialogues below exemplify MF, recasts and other CF types that learners provided in response to their peers' simple past tense errors during the interactional activities. In each example, S1 and S2 indicate Student 1 and Student 2, respectively. CF types are noted in italics (e.g., *(MF)*) at the end of lines in which they occur.

Examples of MF in students' dialogues:

Excerpt 1 (PI+MF group, Telling stories about memory activity):

S1: We went to beach and we swam and there is a sunny weather.

S2: You must use past tense. (MF)

S1: Yes. There was a sunny weather.

Excerpt 2 (PI+MF group, Picture-cued narrative activity):

S1: Because he is very poor.

S2: No. You use past tense, simple past tense. (MF)

S1: He was very poor.

S2: Yes.

Excerpt 3 (PI+MF group, Storytelling activity):

S1: She weared her clothes and began to...

S2: No, weared is false. Wear is irregular verb so... (MF)

S1: wore.

S2: wore yes.

S1: Sorry. She wore her clothes and began to prepare a fruit salad for her grandpa.

Examples of MF with correction:

Instances of MF accompanied by a direct correction were also observed in students' dialogues as follows:

Excerpt 4 (PI+MF group, Storytelling activity):

S1: So she prepared and weared the ...

S2: wear simple past version is "wore". You can use this way. (MF with correction)

S1: wore. And she wore clothes.

Examples of Recasts:

Excerpt 5 (PI+Recast group, Question-and-answer activity):

S1: Where did you go on your last holiday?

S2: we were went to

S1: we went to (Recast)

S2: we went to ...

Excerpt 6 (PI+Recast group, Storytelling activity):

S1: So, she decided to go outside. First, she wear...

S2: wore (Recast)

S1: wore t-shirt and trousers.

Excerpt 7 (PI+Recast group, Question-and-answer activity: Holiday):

S1: Did you buy anything?

S2: I haven't buy

S1: I didn't (*Recast*)

S2: I didn't buy anything.

Examples of other CF types:

Excerpt 8 (PI+MF group, Question-and-answer activity: Birthday):

S1: What did your mother do?

S2: She make a cake.

S1: We don't use "make". We use "made". (*Explicit feedback*)

S2: Yes. She made a cake.

Excerpt 9 (PI+MF group, Picture-cued narrative activity: Family):

S1: What happened at the end of the story? Did the police catch the thief?

S2: At the end of the story, Mary and John became happy. Police catch the thief.

S1: caught or catch? (*Direct question*)

S2: caught caught sorry.

Excerpt 10 (PI+MF group, Telling stories about memory activity):

S1: My friend and I decided to went go away from city center.

S2: went go away? (*Repetition*)

S1: decided to go away from the city center.

Excerpt 11 (PI+Recast group, Question-and-answer activity: Holiday):

S1: What did you wear?

S2: I wear t-shirt.

S1: What? (*Clarification request*)

S2: I wore t-shirt.

Analysis of the receptive and productive measures

To examine the effects of these interventions on students' receptive and productive knowledge of the simple past tense, the acquired data from the GJTs and writing tasks were analyzed using SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) version 22.0. The analysis was based on the scores of the students who attended all of the tests (pre-, post and delayed post-test),

consisting of 23 in the PI group, 18 in the PI+Recast group, and 16 in the PI+MF group. Because Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests indicated that the data were not normally distributed ($p < 0.05$), non-parametric tests were utilized in the analyses. The Kruskal-Wallis test was conducted to assess differences between the groups, and as a follow-up, the Mann-Whitney U test was applied for pairwise comparisons (see Larson-Hall, 2010; Phakiti, 2014). Findings are considered to be statistically significant at the $p \leq 0.05$ level. In the light of the suggestions of some researchers (e.g. Larson-Hall, 2010; Phakiti, 2014), effect size was calculated for the Mann Whitney U test results and interpreted according to Cohen's criteria (1992) in which the values .10, .30 and .50 correspond to small, medium and large effect sizes, respectively.

Findings

Findings of the CF distribution

RQ 1. Is the type and rate of CF provided by students influenced by the explicit training they receive?

The students in the PI+Recast and PI+MF groups were trained to provide their peers' errors with recasts and MF, respectively; however, as exhibited before, a few instances of other CF types (e.g. clarification request) were also found in these groups. In addition to this, there were some instances of PCF in the PI group, which did not receive any CF training. The following table shows how simple past tense errors and all types of target-like CF are distributed in each group.

Table 1: *Distribution of past tense errors and all types of target-like PCF in each group*

Groups	Total number of errors	Total number of target-like PCF
PI group	542	39 (7%)
PI+Recast group	513	185 (36%)
PI+MF group	444	184 (41%)

As the table indicates, the total number of target-like PCF provided to the simple past tense errors in the PI group, PI+Recast group and PI+MF group was 39 (7%), 185 (36%), and 184 (41%), respectively. This shows that the rate of target-like PCF was higher in the PI+Recast and PI+MF groups in comparison to the PI group.

The type and rate of each CF were also reported for each group separately. The findings showed that, as expected, there were only a few instances of CF in the PI group: only 12 students out of 28 were provided with PCF on some of their simple past tense errors, while 16 students did not receive any CF. Only 39 (7%) out of 542 simple past tense errors received target-like PCF in this group. The number of non-target-like (incorrect) CF was only 5 in this group. As the following table shows, the types and frequencies of target-like CF were: recast (n=24; 62%), explicit feedback (n=8; 21%), MF (n=2; 5%), MF with correction (n=3; 8%), repetition (n=1; 3%) and direct question (n=1; 3%).

Table 2: *Distribution of each CF type in the PI group*

CF type	Total (n=39)
Recast	24 (62%)
Explicit feedback	8 (21%)
MF	2 (5%)
MF with correction	3 (8%)
Repetition	1 (3%)
Direct question	1 (3%)

As for PI+Recast group, out of 29 students, only two of them were not provided with CF for their errors in simple past tense. Out of 513 simple past tense errors, 185 (36%) received target-like PCF in this group, with 15 additional instances of incorrect CF. The total target-like CF was composed of 153 (83%) recasts and 32 (17%) other types of CF, consisting of explicit feedback (18; 10%), MF (5; 3%), MF with correction (5; 3%), direct question (3; 2%) and clarification request (1; 1%). Thus, as expected, recasts dominated the CF of the PI+Recast group as the following table presents:

Table 3: *Distribution of each CF type in the PI+Recast group*

CF type	Total (n=185)
Recast	153 (83%)
Explicit feedback	18 (10%)
MF	5 (3%)
MF with correction	5 (3%)
Direct question	3 (2%)
Clarification request	1 (1%)

Finally, PI+MF consisted of 28 students and of these, five students were not given any CF. 184 (41%) out of 444 simple past tense errors were provided with target-like PCF, with 11 additional non-target-like instances. The total number of correctly provided MF and other CF types to simple past tense errors was as follows:

Table 4: *Distribution of each CF type in the PI+MF group*

CF type	Total (n=184)
MF	102 (55%)
MF with correction	19 (10%)
Recast	46 (25%)
Explicit feedback	9 (5%)
Direct question	5 (3%)
Repetition	2 (1%)
Clarification request	1 (1%)

Of the 121 instances of MF, 19 were combined with direct correction. The frequencies of other target-like CF types were as follows: recasts 46 (25%), explicit feedback 9 (5%), direct questions 5 (3%), repetitions 2 (1%), and clarification request 1 (1%). As is clear, MF was the most commonly used CF type in this group.

Findings related to the receptive and productive measures

RQ 2. What are the effects of the PI, the PI+Recast and the PI+MF on receptive and productive knowledge of the target grammar structure?

Findings of the GJTs

Table 5: *Kruskal-Wallis test results of GJTs*

GJTs	PI group (n=23)	PI+Recast group (n=18)	PI+MF group (n=16)	df	X ²	p	Difference
	Mean rank	Mean rank	Mean rank				
pre	28.07	30.44	28.72	2	0.217	0.897	
post	24.87	30.78	32.94	2	2.601	0.272	
delayed	20.85	30.92	38.56	2	11.224	0.004	2>1; 3>1

The findings of the Kruskal Wallis test indicated that there were no statistically significant differences between the groups' pre ($X^2 = 0.217$, $p = 0.897$) and post GJT scores ($X^2 = 2.601$, $p = 0.272$). However, a statistically significant difference was found with respect to the groups' delayed post GJT scores ($X^2 = 11.224$, $p = 0.004$). Therefore, follow-up pairwise comparisons were performed using Mann Whitney U tests to see where the difference stemmed from. A statistically significant difference was observed between the PI+Recast and PI groups' delayed GJT scores ($U = 133.000$, $z = -1.957$, $p = 0.050$, $r = .31$, medium effect size) and the PI+MF and PI groups' delayed GJT scores ($U = 70.500$, $z = -3.257$, $p = 0.001$, $r = 0.52$, large effect size). Both the PI+Recast and PI+MF groups performed better than the PI group on the delayed post GJT. The comparison of the delayed post GJT scores of the PI+Recast and PI+MF groups did not show any statistically significant difference ($U = 104.500$, $z = -1.374$, $p = 0.169$, $r = 0.24$).

Findings of the writing tasks

The groups' writing task scores were compared through the Kruskal Wallis test as shown in the following table:

Table 6: *Kruskal-Wallis test results of the writing tasks*

Writing tasks	PI group (n=23)	PI+Recast group (n=18)	PI+MF group (n=16)	df	X ²	p	Difference
	Mean rank	Mean rank	Mean rank				
pre	25.74	29.61	33.00	2	1.842	0.398	
post	22.57	29.25	37.97	2	8.136	0.017	3>1
delayed	21.37	35.31	32.88	2	8.334	0.016	2>1; 3>1

The findings revealed no statistically significant difference among the pre-writing task scores ($X^2= 1.842, p = 0.398$). On the other hand, there were statistically significant differences in relation to the groups' writing post-task ($X^2= 8.136, p= 0.017$) and writing delayed post task scores ($X^2= 8.334, p = 0.016$). Further statistical analyses were conducted using the Mann Whitney U test for pairwise comparisons. A statistically significant difference was found between the post writing task scores of the PI+MF and PI group, with a close-to-large effect size ($U = 83.500, z = -2.870, p = 0.004, r = 0.46$). This statistical finding indicates that the PI+MF group's performance was better than the PI group in the post writing task. No significant differences were found between the post writing task scores of the PI+Recast and PI+MF groups ($U = 101.000, z = -1.484, p = 0.138, r = 0.25$) and the PI and PI+Recast groups ($U = 159.500, z = -1.248, p = 0.212, r = 0.19$). As for the comparison of the delayed writing task scores, a statistically significant difference with a medium effect size was observed between the PI+Recast and PI groups ($U = 118.500, z = -2.326, p = 0.020, r = 0.35$). There was also a statistically significant difference between the PI+MF and PI groups with an effect size between moderate and large ($U = 97.000, z = -2.484, p = 0.013, r = 0.40$). Contrary to this, no statistically significant difference was found between the PI+Recast and PI+MF groups' delayed writing scores ($U = 119.000, z = -0.863, p = 0.388, r = 0.15$). In sum, the findings regarding the delayed writing task scores show that both the PI+MF and PI+Recast groups performed significantly better than the PI group.

Discussion and Conclusion

This study has investigated whether training learners as CF providers is effective in improving their knowledge of a target grammatical structure. Learners' interactions in the PI+Recast and PI+MF groups were analyzed to find out whether they were able to give the target CF types (i.e. recasts and MF) to their peers' simple past tense errors. Additionally, learners' interactions in the PI only group were analyzed to see whether the learners would give CF to

each other's simple past tense errors, even though they did not receive any feedback training. As expected, the total number of target-like CF instances was higher in the PI+Recast and PI+MF groups when compared to the PI group. These findings indicate that training learners as feedback providers was useful in raising the learners' awareness about the target grammatical errors. This is in agreement with the findings of Sato and Lyster (2012) who emphasized the awareness raising function of CF training. Likewise, considering the rate of CF in each group, it can be concluded that the learners who received CF training were more attentive and focused on errors related to the target grammatical forms.

In this study, there were 439 CF instances in total: this number was composed of 408 (93%) target-like and 31 (7%) non-target-like CF. In other words, although some students did receive 'incorrect' CF from peers, the vast majority of PCF received was accurate. Moreover, both the receptive and productive measures indicate beneficial effects of PCF. Regarding the effectiveness of PCF given in the context of learner-learner interactive activities, in their comparison of teacher and peer feedback, Sippel and Jackson (2015) argued that, "while the learners in the teacher feedback group benefited primarily from the high quality and quantity of feedback, the learners in peer feedback group may have benefitted from additional factors, including self-corrections and group discussions about linguistic forms" (p.700). They also observed that, although learners adopt passive roles while receiving teacher CF, during PI activities, by being both feedback receivers and providers, they adopt more active roles in their learning process (see also Adams et al., 2011; Sato & Lyster, 2012). Likewise, in the current study, it was seen that learners took active roles in their own and their peers' learning process by providing as well as receiving CF during interactive activities. This active involvement in the learning process and collaborative work, despite a small number of inaccurate CF instances, seems to contribute significantly to learners' achievement.

Consistent with previous research (e.g. Garcia-Mayo & Pica, 2000; Ohta, 2000; Sato & Lyster, 2012; Sippel & Jackson, 2015), these findings show how learners have the potential to contribute to each other's learning. Additionally, the results regarding the high number of MF in the PI+MF group and recasts in the PI+Recast group indicate that learners can learn how to provide the target CF after short-term training. Contrary to the feedback groups, CF occurred at a very low frequency in the PI group, either because the students did not know how to correct errors (Sato & Lyster, 2012), or because they ignored errors that they noticed, as they were not encouraged to make corrections. On this basis, training learners as CF providers seems to be a real necessity (Bruton & Samuda, 1980); however, it is important to keep in mind that learners may not be able to provide CF for every error, as they have to focus both on meaning and linguistic structures during the flow of the interaction. The crucial point here is to foster learners' awareness of the importance of providing CF for each other's errors, and to increase their sense of responsibility for their own and their peers' learning.

Overall, the findings reveal that there is no superiority of the PI group over the feedback groups, and also there was not any statistically significant difference between the two feedback groups. It can therefore be concluded that combining PI with PCF is helpful in improving both receptive knowledge and correct use of the target grammatical forms, as CF can prompt learners to attend to the target structures. This account is consistent with previous studies, including Sato and Lyster (2012), which concluded that learners, when provided with PCF during interactive activities, could direct their attention to both meaning and form. Therefore, the findings can be seen both as a reminder of Schmidt's Noticing Hypothesis (1990, 2012), which emphasizes the crucial role of noticing for the learning of the target language forms, and as a support of prior studies that highlight the positive link between CF, noticing and development of the L2 (e.g. Gass & Mackey, 2007; Mackey, 2006; Philp, 2003; Sheen, 2007).

Furthermore, this study is in agreement with other work suggesting that serving as both CF providers and receivers may help learners to focus their attention on the use of the target forms, and thereby to notice and discriminate between grammatical and ungrammatical forms (Chu, 2013; Sato & Lyster, 2012; Sippel & Jackson, 2015). The results also support previous claims that PI through communicative tasks alone is not as successful as the combination of PI and PCF in promoting the learning of target forms (e.g. Sato & Lyster, 2012; Sippel & Jackson, 2015). For example, in Sato and Lyster's (2012) study, PI alone was not as facilitative for grammatical accuracy as PI in combination with PCF. In a similar vein, Sippel and Jackson (2015) suggested that learning different grammatical forms can be facilitated through CF provided by learners. Another important finding is that, although the PI+Recast group performed better than the PI group only in the delayed post writing task, the PI+MF group showed superiority over the PI group in both post and delayed post writing tasks. This short and long-term success in using the target structure correctly can be linked to a salient feature of MF, the prompting of learners to self-correct (see Ammar & Spada, 2006; Lyster, 2004; Yang & Lyster, 2010).

Although both feedback groups were found to have superior performance relative to the PI group, it was not the case that PI alone did not contribute to the process of learning of the target forms. The mean scores of the writing tasks in the PI group show an increase from pre- (M=60.393) to post- (M=71.216) and to delayed post-test (M=73.688), which may have resulted from the opportunity learners were given to practice the target structure through interactive tasks. Furthermore, instances of PCF, despite being very few in number in the PI group, may have helped those learners who provided and received it. This is in agreement with the findings of McDonough (2004), who analyzed the interaction of learners with no feedback training; in this context, negative feedback in learner-learner interactions was found to have positive effects on the learning of the linguistic forms. Nevertheless, as noted earlier, the use of PCF in PI tasks seems to be more

beneficial for learning of the target language structures (see Sato & Lyster, 2012; Sippel, 2017; Sippel & Jackson, 2015).

When taken together, the results of the current study support the findings of prior research suggesting that PCF is facilitative for learning the target language's structures. Moreover, this study also suggests that the integration of PCF into PI can help L2 learners gain more control over the target linguistic form in both receptive and productive terms. Considering this, it seems very important to foster L2 learners' awareness about accurate and inaccurate uses of the target L2 forms through training them as CF providers for each other.

Note

This article is part of the first author's PhD dissertation completed under the supervision of the second author.

Acknowledgment

This research study was supported by the Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TUBITAK).

The Authors

Hatice OKYAR, the corresponding author, currently works as an assistant professor at Necmettin Erbakan University, School of Foreign Languages, Konya, Turkey. Her research interests comprise second and foreign language education, language learning strategies, and language teaching methodology.

Gonca EKŞİ is working as an associate professor in the Department of English Language Teaching at Gazi University, Turkey. Her research interests are teacher training, young learners of English, materials development, corpora and language teaching, and technology and language teaching. She can be reached at goncayangin@gmail.com.

References

- Adams, R. (2007). Do second language learners benefit from interacting with each other? In A. Mackey (Ed.), *Conversational interaction in second language acquisition* (pp. 29-51). Oxford: Oxford University.
- Adams, R., Nuevo, A. M., & Egi, T. (2011). Explicit and implicit feedback, modified output, and SLA: Does explicit and implicit feedback promote learning and learner-learner interactions? *The Modern Language Journal*, 95, 42-63.
- Algarawi, B. S. (2010). *The effects of repair techniques on L2 learning as a product and as a process: A CA-for-SLA investigation of classroom interaction*. Doctoral Dissertation, Newcastle University.
- Ammar, A., & Spada, N. (2006). One size fits all? Recasts, prompts, and L2 learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28(4), 543-574.
- Anderson, J. R. (1983). A spreading activation theory of memory. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 22, 261-295.
- Anderson, J. R. (1993). *Rules of the mind*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Anderson, J. R. (2005). *Cognitive psychology and its implications*. New York: Worth.
- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (3rd ed.). White Plains, NY: Pearson.
- Bruton, A., & Samuda, V. (1980). Learner and teacher roles in the treatment of oral error in group work. *RELC Journal*, 11, 49-63.
- Carroll, S., & Swain, M. (1993). Explicit and implicit negative feedback: An empirical study of the learning of linguistic generalizations. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 15, 357-386.
- Chamot, A., Barnhardt, S., El-Dinary, P., & Robbins, J. (1999). *The learning strategies handbook*. New York: Longman.

- Chu, R. (2013). *Effects of peer feedback on Taiwanese adolescents' English speaking practices and development*. Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Edinburgh.
- Coelho, E. (2004). *Adding English: A guide to teaching in multilingual classrooms*. Toronto: Pippin.
- Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112 (1), 155-159.
- Collins, T. (2009). *Correct your English errors: Avoid 99% of the common mistakes made learners of English*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- DeKeyser, R. (2007). Introduction: Situating the concept of practice. In R. DeKeyser (Ed.), *Practice in a second language: Perspectives from applied linguistics and cognitive psychology* (pp.1-18). Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- DeKeyser, R. (2017). Knowledge and skill in ISLA. In S. Loewen & M. Sato (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of instructed second language acquisition* (pp. 15-32). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Devos, N. J. (2016). *Peer interactions in new content and language integrated settings*. Switzerland: Springer International.
- Dilans, G. (2010). Corrective feedback and L2 vocabulary development: Prompts and recasts in the adult ESL classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 66, 787-816.
- Ellis, R. (2006). Current issues in the teaching of grammar: An SLA perspective, *TESOL Quarterly*, 40, 83-107.
- Ellis, R. (2007). The differential effects of corrective feedback on two grammatical structures. In A. Mackey (Ed.), *Conversational interaction in second language acquisition: A collection of empirical studies* (pp. 339-360). Oxford: Oxford University.
- Ellis, R. (2008). *The study of second language acquisition* (2nd ed.).Oxford: Oxford University.
- Ellis, R. (2015). *Understanding second language acquisition* (2nd ed.) Oxford, UK: Oxford University.

- Ellis, R., Loewen, S., & Erlam, R. (2006). Implicit and explicit corrective feedback and the acquisition of L2 grammar. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28, 339-368.
- Ellis, R., & Sheen, Y. (2006). Reexamining the role of recasts in second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28, 575-600.
- Erlam, R. M., & Loewen, S. (2010). Implicit and explicit recasts in L2 oral French interaction. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 67, 877-905.
- Foster, P., & Ohta, A. S. (2005). Negotiation for meaning and peer assistance in second language classrooms. *Applied Linguistics*, 26, 402-430.
- García Mayo, M., & Pica, T. (2000). Interaction among proficient learners: Are input, feedback and output needs addressed in a foreign language context? *Studia Linguistica*, 54(2), 272-279.
- Gass, S. M. (1994). The reliability of second-language grammaticality judgments. In E. E. Tarone, S. M. Gass, & A. D. Cohen (Eds.), *Research methodology in second language acquisition* (pp. 303-322). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Gass, S. M. (1997). *Input, interaction and the second language learner*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Gass, S. M. (2003). Input and interaction. In C. Doughty & M. H. Long (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 224-255). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Gass, S. M., Behney, J., & Plonsky, L. (2013) *Second language acquisition: An introductory course* (4th ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Gass, S. M., & Mackey, A. (2007). Input, interaction and output in second language acquisition. In B. VanPatten & J. Williams (Eds.), *Theories in second language acquisition: An introduction* (pp. 175-199). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching* (4th ed.). Pearson: Longman.

- Kartchava, E., & Ammar, A. (2014). The noticeability and effectiveness of corrective feedback in relation to target type. *Language Teaching Research*, 18(4), 428–452.
- Larson-Hall, J. (2010). *A guide to doing statistics in second language research using SPSS*. New York: Routledge.
- Leeman, J. (2007). Feedback in L2 learning: Responding to errors during practice. In R. M. DeKeyser (Ed.), *Practice in a second language: Perspectives from linguistics and psychology* (pp. 111-137). Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2006). *How languages are learned* (3rd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University.
- Loewen, S., & Nabei, T. (2007). Measuring the effects of oral corrective feedback on L2 knowledge. In A. Mackey (Ed.), *Conversational interaction in second language acquisition: A series of empirical studies* (pp. 361-377). Oxford: Oxford University.
- Loewen, S., & Philp, J. (2006). *Recasts in adult English L2 classrooms: Characteristics, explicitness, and effectiveness*. *The Modern Language Journal*, 90, 536-556.
- Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413-468). New York: Academic.
- Long, M. H. (2007). *Problems in second language acquisition*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Lyster, R. (2004). Differential effects of prompts and recasts in form-focused instruction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 26, 399-432.
- Lyster, R., Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (1999). A response to 'What's wrong with oral grammar correction.' *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 55, 457–467.
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 20, 37–66.

- Lyster, R., & Saito, K. (2010). Oral feedback in classroom SLA: A meta-analysis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32, 265-302.
- Lyster, R., Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2013). Oral corrective feedback in second language classrooms. *Language Teaching*, 46(1), 1-40.
- Lyster, R., & Sato, M. (2013). Skill acquisition theory and the role of practice in L2 development. In M. García Mayo, J. Gutierrez-Mangado, & M. M. Adrián (Eds.), *Contemporary approaches to second language acquisition* (pp. 71-92). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Mackey, A. (2006). Feedback, noticing and instructed second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 27(3), 405-430.
- McDonough, K. (2004). Learner-learner interaction during pair and small group activities in a Thai EFL context. *System*, 32, 207-224.
- McLaughlin, B., & Heredia, R. (1996). Information-processing approaches to research on second language acquisition and use. W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 213-228). San Diego: Academic.
- Miller, P. C. (2003). *The effectiveness of corrective feedback: A meta-analysis*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Purdue University, USA.
- Morris, F. A. (2002). Negotiation moves and recasts in relation to error types and learner repair in the foreign language classroom. *Foreign Language Annals*, 35, 395-404.
- Nassaji, H. (2015). *The Interactional feedback dimension in instructed second language learning*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Ohta, A. S. (2000). Rethinking recasts: A learner-centered examination of corrective feedback in the Japanese language classroom. In J. K. Hall & L. S. Verplaetse (Eds.), *Second and foreign language learning through classroom interaction* (pp. 47-71). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

- Panova, I., & Lyster, R. (2002). Patterns of corrective feedback and uptake in an adult ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 36(4), 573-595.
- Pawlak, M. (2014). *Error correction in the foreign language classroom. Reconsidering the issues*. Heidelberg/New York: Springer.
- Phakiti, A. (2014). *Experimental research methods in language learning*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Philp, J. (2003). Constraints on “noticing the gap”: Non-native speakers’ noticing of recasts in NS-NNS interaction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 25, 99-126.
- Philp, J., Adams, R., & Iwashita, N. (2014). *Peer interaction and second language learning*. New York: Routledge.
- Philp, J., Walter, S., & Basturkmen, H. (2010). Peer interaction in the foreign language classroom: What factors foster a focus on form? *Language Awareness*, 19(4), 261-279.
- Ranta, L., & Lyster, R. (2007). A cognitive approach to improving immersion students’ oral language abilities: The awareness-practice-feedback sequence. In R.M. DeKeyser (Ed.), *Practice in a second language: Perspectives from linguistics and psychology* (pp. 141-160). Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Reinders, H. (2010). *The effect of task type and instructions on second language acquisition*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars.
- Russell, J., & Spada, N. (2006). The effectiveness of corrective feedback for second language acquisition: A meta-analysis of the research. In J. M. Norris & L. Ortega (Eds.), *Synthesizing research on language learning and teaching* (pp. 131-164). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Sato, M. (2011). *Peer interaction and corrective feedback: Proceduralization of grammar knowledge in classroom settings*. Doctoral Dissertation, McGill University, Canada.
- Sato, M., & Ballinger, S. (2016). *Peer interaction and second language learning: Pedagogical potential and research agenda*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Sato, M., & Lyster, R. (2012). Peer interaction and corrective feedback for accuracy and fluency development: Monitoring, practice, and proceduralization. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 34, 591-626.
- Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 11, 129-158.
- Schmidt, R. (2012). Attention, awareness, and individual differences in language learning. In W. M. Chan, K. N. Chin, S. K. Bhatt, & I. Walker (Eds.), *Perspectives on individual characteristics and foreign language education* (pp. 27-50). Boston, MA: De Gruyter.
- Sheen, Y. (2007). The effects of corrective feedback, language aptitude and learner attitudes on The acquisition of English articles. In A. Mackey (Ed.), *Conversational interaction in second language acquisition: A collection of empirical studies* (pp. 301-322). Oxford: Oxford University.
- Sheen, Y. (2010). Differential effects of oral and written corrective feedback in the ESL classroom. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32, 203-232.
- Sippel, L. (2017). *The effects of peer interaction, form-focused instruction, and peer corrective feedback on the acquisition of grammar and vocabulary in L2 German*. Doctoral Dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University.
- Sippel, L., & Jackson, C. N. (2015). Teacher vs. peer oral corrective feedback in the German Language classroom. *Foreign Language Annals*, 48(4), 688-705.
- Yang, Y. (2008). *Corrective feedback and Chinese learners' acquisition of English past tense*. Doctoral Dissertation, McGill University.
- Yang, Y., & Lyster, R. (2010). Effects of form-focused practice and feedback on Chinese EFL learners' acquisition of regular and irregular past tense forms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32, 235-263.

Appendix 1

Sample dialogue excerpts for the modelling of recasts and MF (T= Teacher, S= Student).

<i>Recast</i>	
<i>Example 1</i>	<i>Example 2</i>
T: What did you do yesterday?	T: Why were the children so happy?
S: Well, I try to finish the project at school.	S: Because we gived them lots of toys.
T: tried (<i>Recast</i>)	T: Gave (<i>Recast</i>)
S: Sorry, tried.	S: OK
<i>Metalinguistic feedback</i>	
<i>Example 1</i>	<i>Example 2</i>
T: What did you do yesterday?	T: Why were the children so happy?
S: Well, I try to finish the project at school.	S: Because we gived them lots of toys.
T: Please use simple past tense. (<i>MF</i>)	T: Don't add -ed. Give is an irregular verb. (<i>MF</i>)
S: Sorry, tried.	S: OK

Appendix 2

Examples of use-in-context activities

a) A part of the “question and answer activity 1”

Student A: You ask the following questions to your partner about his/her last holiday. You are also free to ask extra questions in addition to the ones given below.

Student B: You answer the questions.

1. Where did you go on your last holiday?
2. When did you go?
3. How did you go there? By car, by bus or by train?
4. What did you take with you?
5. Who did you go with? With your family or with your friends?

b) Storytelling activity 1

Student A: Please make up a story by using the verbs in the box below. The first few sentences of the story are given for you. Please continue the

story by using simple past tense. If you need, you may also use different verbs to tell your story. Try to make at least 12 sentences.

Verb List

begin, decide, wear, prepare, bring, take, sit, feel, send,
give, visit, play

It was a beautiful sunny Sunday. Helen wanted to go outside so she

c) A part of the “picture-cued narrative activity 1”

Student A: Look at the following pictures and compose a story by using the verbs and keywords. Use simple past tense to tell the story. The first sentence is given for you as an introduction. While telling the story, you are free to use extra verbs and words in addition to the given ones. After finishing your story, ask your partner the attached questions.

Don't forget to use connectors: “one day, first, next, then, after that, finally, etc.”

Don't forget to use conjunctions: “and, or, but, so, because, etc.”

Last summer Jack and his sister Mary decided to go on a holiday. They

